[13th November 1922

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) There is no proposal before Government at present to re-open the courts referred to.

Report on the 'Train tragedy.'

365 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member and the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state the reasons for the delay in the publication of the report on the 'Train tragedy'?

A.—Attention is invited to the Government of India's resolution on the subject published on the 30th August 1922.

Abolition of Sub-Magistrate's Court at Alattur, Malabar.

366 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that inconvenience is caused to the people of Alattur and its neighbourhood in the district of Malabar by the abolition of the Sub-Magistrate's Court in that locality; and

(*b*) whether the Government intend to re-establish the court at an early date?

A.—The Court has not been abolished. But certain sub-magistrates have been deputed as summary magistrates for the trial of rebellion cases, their ordinary work being done by neighbouring sub-magistrates. The Sub-Magistrate of Alattur is one of these. His work is at present being managed by the Tahsildar and the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Palghat, who sit at Alattur occasionally. No complaint has been received by the Government alleging any inconvenience caused by this arrangement to the people of Alattur and its neighbourhood.

Promotions of sarishtadars of district and sessions courts.

367 *Q.*—Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether sarishtadars of district and sessions courts have, in the past, been promoted to the High Court as sub-assistant registrars; and

(*b*) if so, in how many instances?

A.—The Government have no information.

Coconut palm pest at Mangalore.

368 *Q.*—Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the citizens of Mangalore have asked for the extension of the Pest Act to the city of Mangalore, to eradicate the coconut palm pest which has appeared in the city;

(*b*) whether the Government are aware that the pest has already attacked over 5,000 palms; and

(*c*) whether it is proposed to extend the provisions of the Pest Act early so that the disease may be stamped out?

A.—(*a*) The Government have received no application for the application of the Pest Act. They understand that a resolution was passed at a meeting held at Mangalore on 31st July 1922 requesting the Government to introduce the Act.

13th November 1922]

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The Collector reported in July last that the control and preventive measures carried on by the Revenue and Agricultural officers with the co-operation of the public had had very beneficial effects and that the pest had been brought under control without compulsion or recourse to the provisions of the Act, which the Government are loath to apply if it can be avoided. The Act will, however, be introduced if the measures now in operation prove ineffectual. The position is being carefully watched by the Collector and the Agricultural Department.

Criminal settlements in the Guntūr district.

369 *Q.*—Khan Sahib Munshi MUHAMMAD ABDUR RAHMAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) when the following criminal settlements were established in Guntūr district :—

(i) Yerukula settlements at Sitanagaram,

(ii) Criminal settlements at Stuartspeta near Bapatla, and

(iii) Reformatory at Guntūr ;

(*b*) what the object of the Government was in opening these settlements in taluk towns ;

(*c*) what is the annual expenditure incurred for meeting these three institutions ;

(*d*) whether the Government are aware of the amount of anxiety and trouble caused to the peaceful inhabitants residing in the vicinity ;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the managers of these settlements are given Local Fund and Public Works Department contracts ; and

(*f*) whether it is a fact that these criminal gangs are kept outside the settlements for days together and their stay in the vicinity of villages is causing trouble to the ryots ?

A.—(*a*) The Sitanagaram settlement was established in the year 1913 and Stuartpuram in 1914. The Guntūr settlement was started as a prisoner's home in 1913 and was declared a reformatory settlement under the Criminal Tribes Act in the year 1917.

(*b*) The hon. Member is presumably referring to Guntūr settlement, the other two settlements not being at Taluk headquarters. Guntūr settlement is intended for the reception of the incorrigible members of criminal tribes. The policy of Government is generally to locate settlements in places where sufficient work on a remunerative basis is available for the settlers ;

(*c*) The hon. Member's attention is invited to page 198 of the preliminary edition of the Civil Budget Estimate for the year 1922–23 ;

(*d*) The Government have no information ;

(*e*) Managers of Sitanagaram and Guntūr settlements are occasionally given Local Fund or Public Works Department contract. The Manager of Stuartpuram settlement takes no such contract ;